

THE THEORIES
of EVOLUTION
and the FACTS *of*
PALEONTOLOGY



By

HARRY RIMMER

President

RESEARCH SCIENCE BUREAU, Incorporated

4-2 9.35

The Theories *of* Evolution *and the* Facts *of* Paleontology



By
HARRY RIMMER, President
RESEARCH SCIENCE BUREAU, Inc.
5141 Crenshaw Boulevard
Los Angeles, Calif.

Copyright 1935 by
Research Science Bureau, Inc.
From the press of
Glendale Printers, Glendale, Calif.

THE THEORIES OF EVOLUTION AND THE FACTS OF PALEONTOLOGY

"PALEONTOLOGY" says the dictionary, "is the science that deals with the life of past geological periods." So the sources of this science differ from the sources of biology, or zoology, or botany, in that the individuals under observation are no longer alive, but are in a fossil condition. Ages have fled past since the creatures whose fossil remains we now observe were alive and sentient, and in the science of paleontology we have the evidences of life as it once was, rather than as it now is.

But "paleontology" is really more than just what the dictionary thus suggests. It has proved to be the Waterloo of the theory of evolution! In the limits of this field of research the theory of organic evolution chose to make its most notable fight; and here in this field the theory met its most tragic defeat. The facts of paleontology really constitute a refutation of the entire basis of the theory of the transmutation of species.

It has been estimated (Wassman) that there have been one hundred twenty two million, five hundred thousand species of living creatures in the past ages that are now extinct, and this vast aggregation of individuals, or such of them as remain in fragmentary or fossil form, constitute the material of the paleontologist. The number of individuals that have lived in this vast mass of species, and in the geological periods that form what is known as the vital life period of the earth's history, is of course practically infinite. No mind can comprehend the successive generations, the accu-

ing mass of individuals in just one species over a period of merely ten thousand years; how much more impossible then to effectively contemplate all the individuals in a hundred million species, over a period variously estimated to be from one hundred million years, to two thousand billion years!

A pair of field mice, for instance, if all their progeny lived, and the family of this one pair produced at their normal rate undisturbed for one calendar year, would in those twelve months witness a family of a little over a million individual descendants! This tiny rodent is not unusually prolific when contrasted to other wild creatures, especially those of past ages, if we can judge by the fossil records. So that even if unnumbered millions of individuals in each species so perished in every generation as to leave no paleontological trace, there must still have been multiplied billions of others that somewhere left an evidence of their existence. We suggest this merely to remind the reader that the sources of paleontology are by no means limited, and that there is a host of material from which to draw scientific conclusions.

In the Trabucca ledges, which are so well known to the author, in one exposed section that is about a half mile long and some six hundred feet high there are exposed to the gaze of the geologist who is fortunate enough to study this stupendous deposit **not less than ten billion individual fossils!** and no man can say how deep through the mountain the deposit may extend. From this one source alone paleontology may well draw certain conclusions, if mass of evidence is a factor in deduction of scientific truth. And after years of interested observation we venture the assertion that nowhere in the science of paleontology has the theory of organic evolution been established or even helped.

A generation ago it was confidently asserted that

when the records of the fossil life had been fairly well gathered they would establish beyond the shadow of a doubt the truth of the theory of the transmutation of species, and the rise of new genera through this process of evolution. The contention, we must admit, seemed well founded. Not only well founded, but also essential, as every other physical science had failed to produce conclusive evidence of the process of evolution. It was also the logical conclusion, that if the fact of evolution was to be established, that science which deals with life that has been, should hold this needed proof.

The record has been assembled. The tale is told, and the false contentions of an unscientific dogma have again met defeat. For in the science of paleontology the theory of organic evolution met the most drastic refutation it has ever experienced.

THREE IMMUTABLE FACTS NOTED IN THE STUDY OF PALEONTOLOGY

The first of these is the absolute fixity of certain species. In the light of the claims made for organic evolution this fact is fatal to the hopes of the theory. It is the contention of the evolutionist that life has progressed from the simple forms to the complex through an infinite number of gradations. Through myriad changes the protozoa evolved into the metazoa: and this supposed progress has been dramatically pictured in the slogan "From the small to the large!" Uncountable millions of individuals have lived and died to make one slight change, says the theory under discussion, and the new forms thus slowly arising have in time produced the highly specialized species and genera we see in the universe today. If this is true, then in the science that

deals with the living creatures of past ages, we should be able to trace that process of development and change.

The contrary, however, is the case. Individuals do not progress gradually into new forms, varieties and species; but individuals seem to insist upon the right to be, and remain, just essentially what their ancestors ever have been. The absolute unswerving constancy to type is the most striking aspect of the fossil record, and therein we see without exception the miracle of obedience to Nature's law, that like shall produce like. We know that that is now the case, and in the records of paleontology we also read that it has ever been the case. Apparent exceptions to this law will be dealt with in the body of this paper. At this point we desire simply to stress the fact that the so-called law of evolution is not now operative, and has not been in operation as far back as the records of the rocks may be traced.

The evolutionary school of geology has carefully worked out a time factor for many ages past, and without prejudicing our position by acquiescence, we will conform to their dogma purely for the sake of meeting their arguments on their own ground. In this manner we desire to show that as far as the mind of man has been able to explore there has been no evolution of species. Rather in place of that exploded theory there has been a remarkable fidelity to original type that establishes the general phenomenon of the fixity of species.

The first life appeared on this planet, according to the chronology of evolution, in the far away period called the Cambrian. So utterly impossible is it to make any kind of a reasonable guess at the probable age this represents we will not even make the attempt, but will satisfy ourselves with the observation that it is a tremendous sweep of time. Certain schools of geology

claim it is a hundred million years, others say it is a thousand million years, others of us are more conservative and content ourselves with simply saying "We don't know," which we are convinced is by far the wisest course. It is evident, however, that the span of time is positively inconceivable to the human mind, and we cannot truly apprehend the enormous gap that stretches between the Silurian period and the age of man.

We have, however, some evidence that certain species common to our day were in existence then. There are innumerable specimens of the Silurian coral in existence, and we will note their testimony to start with. The coral islands are the result of the simple process of biology. Coral is the body of a small insect, and by the simple process of living and dying these minute creatures have succeeded in building up islands, and even continents may be the result of their lives. It takes literally myriads of these tiny animals to make even a lump of the calcareous deposit we commonly call coral, and it defies the imagination to seek to estimate the countless number required to make a habitable island rising out of the floor of the sea. We know a great deal about these polyps that make the coral, and their morphology is pretty thoroughly mastered by zoologists.

The coral polyps have been here industriously working since the far away Silurian period. This we know by the discovery of innumerable specimens in fossil form, and we have inland sections where they may be excavated almost by the ton. Places where the sea once was, but where desert now prevails. Just how long that has been no one can say; but we do know that evolution has not operated among these polyps in that immense span of time, as the present day descendants of the Silurian coral animals are identical with their

Silurian ancestors! The time element has ever been the great retreat, and support of the organic evolutionist. When we say that we do not see evolution in operation in nature about us, the reply invariably is to the effect that the process is so slow millions of years are required. Well, in this case, according to their own claims, they have them. Not only millions but **billions** of years have gone by since the Silurian period, (according to their own school) and there has been no evolution in this animal.

From the Silurian period we also draw the evidence of the primitive algae, and we find the same condition existed then as now, the algae have not evolved in those multiplied millions of years. The Chlorophyceae were especially numerous in that period, and living as they do today in such profusion, form an interesting field for contrast and research. What happened here, if the law of evolution is a true law? How does it happen that the lowly alga still remains the same as its fossil ancestry ever has been? All down through the ages these evidences have been preserved in the living rock, to testify to those whose minds were open to the reception of truth, that species may rise and wane, new varieties may and do appear, but life **does not** evolve from the simple to the complex. The algae are today as simple as they were in the very dawn of time.

These are not exceptional cases. Back in the Carboniferous age the crayfish were abundant, and they are almost as numerous today. These crustaceans are found in profusion in the fossil bearing strata of the far away Carboniferous period, and their testimony is the same as the record from the preceding age, they are the same today as they were in antiquity. Among the oldest living orders present today, they also speak of the fixity of species.

In the state of Montana, there is a spectacle that

every scientist in the world should see, the famous Grasshopper Glacier. It is amazing that so few paleontologists seem to realize the existence of this famous glacier, but the author has talked with many men who are reputed authorities in this field, and never found one who had personally investigated this site. The glacier gets its name from the characteristic fossil it contains, the humble grasshopper.

At one time this entire region was an Eden of tropical splendor. All the fossil flora of this region are tropical, ferns and palms abound. This once was a vast and magnificent lake, and life literally teemed along its shores and in its depths. Now the iron clutch of eternal winter has bound the waters that once were warm and living, and a white death prevails. This glacier is a relic of the great ice age that once visited this continent. How long ago that was we will leave to the evolutionary philosopher to state; we personally have no way of telling. According to their dogma it was a long, long time.

It is evident that this ice age was not a gradual encroachment, but that it came catastrophically. In the day before this ice age came the region of these mountains swarmed with grasshoppers, and it is the custom of these creatures to migrate ahead of a slowly encroaching cold. But when the lake turned to a glacier these billions of grasshoppers were surprised by the sudden freeze, and they fell into the lake in uncountable numbers. As the lake froze from the top to the bottom these insects were preserved in a matrix of ice, and they remain there to this present day. They were of the family Acrididae, which family is still numerous on this continent, and these fossil specimens may be procured in unlimited quantities by those who care to go and get them. The main point of their introduction here, however, is the evidence they offer as to the fixity

of species. These pre-historic grasshoppers, so marvelously preserved for our study in these early ages, are identical with their twentieth century descendants. Since before the Ice Age, to this very hour, the Acrididae have failed to obey the supposed-law of evolution, and their morphology remains as it ever has been.

The author has a noted collection of moss agates that are also of interest in the discussion of this issue. No one can say how old the moss agates are. Concerning their formation the student may learn many things, as for instance their origin. We know that they are a variegated chalcedony, formed by the action of water rising through certain bodies of chemical salts in the earth. The water evaporates and leaves the mineral contained therein to precipitate and form the agate, a semi-precious gem stone. If the water contains also certain mineral oxides, such as oxide of iron, zinc, or lead, these oxides having no affinity with the chalcedon are isolated into exquisite patterns that look like moss giving this stone its common name, "moss agate." When we seek information as to the date of their origin the details are not so specific: We are told that they were brought to their present location by the action of glaciers; that they probably originated many leagues away from where they are now found, and that "they were made when the earth was young!"

When the earth was young! That is a long time ago. The author has had the privilege of knowing a moss agate that contains a mosquito! There, forever imprisoned and eternally preserved in the agate formation is our common friend, the mosquito. Let us join in a paean of praise that the "law" of evolution did not work here! If the agates were formed when the earth was young, and the mosquitoes then were as they are now, what a plight the resident of New Jersey would

be in today. From the simple to the complex would mean that the mosquitoes today would be as large as the eagles, at the very least.

The law has not worked in this species, however. The mosquito imprisoned in the forming agate "when the earth was young" is identical with its descendant of the present day; it has not progressed from the simple to the complex.

There are other substances that have provided a perfect matrix for the preservation of fossil forms, notably the substance called amber. In pre-historic times there were certain trees much like the conifers of the present time that secreted a gum, or resin, similar to pine or spruce gum. This gum dripped from those ancient trees and fell into the ground where it became solidified over the passing ages, and this fossil gum is called amber. Trees in that day were the favorite ranging field of ants even as they are today, and in this sticky pitch innumerable of these pre-historic ants became entangled, so that when the resin petrified into amber the ants were fossilized therein. In this matrix the ants are perfectly adapted to observation, and we find that the ants of the epoch when amber was but pitch on trees, were practically identical with the ants of the present day. They too have failed to progress from the simple to the complex. Evolution somehow failed to include them in its program of advancement from the small to the large, and we see once more the fixity of species established.

The ants are not the only insects that are found in this matrix of amber. It is presumed that the amber was largely formed in the Tertiary period, principally from the tree known as "*Pinites succinifer*" and its allied forms. Many varieties and species of insects were trapped in the resin of these trees, and all tell the same story of the constancy of species and genus. In-

deed, the author has one such lump of fossil gum that contains eleven individual fossils, comprising seven different species. The fossil gum is clear, and its qualities of refraction are such as to allow examination under the lense of a binocular magnifier, and the microscope attests that there has been no evolution in the species contained. They have one and all failed to evolve from the small to the large, from the simple to the complex.

The most prolific fossil strata of the Pacific Coast are undoubtedly the Eocene. In the region of the Coast Range mountains, along the entire coastal plains, on the plateaus and the mesas of the coast we find the fossils of the Eocene in tremendous profusion. They range in size from the tiny *territullia* to the giant sharks and immense whales that have left their bones in profusion upon our mountain tops. It is a spectacle to cause wonder always, when we find sharks and whales peacefully imbedded in living rock seven or eight thousand feet above sea level, and thirty or forty miles away from the nearest beach! They must have been there a long, long time; and in all that span of years their testimony is the same; evolution has passed their innumerable progeny by. Not one of them has progressed from the simple to the complex.

Living in the Pacific Ocean today are practically all the species of genera found in fossil form in the strata of the Eocene. That is to say the fossil ancestors have left present day progeny that differ from them in no whit; evolution has passed them all by. Not in a few scattered or isolated cases, but in innumerable species we see the true law of life established in the records of paleontology: the law of the fixity of species.

The laws of Nature are immutable. They are never rescinded or rendered inoperative by later thought, and they operate with inexorable precision. It is absolutely

inconceivable that the law of evolution should operate in a few certain species and miss all the rest, but this is the present contention of the evolutionary philosopher. If the law of evolution ever operated it would be in force now, but as far back as the records of the rocks extend it has never been in operation.

The reader will perhaps at this point pause and enquire, "How about the horse?," and we can only plead for a little patience. We are rapidly coming to an examination of the so-called perfect demonstration of the case of evolution in the genus equus. We will examine the horse when we arrive at the logical point in our discussion.

The second fact we note is the evidence of degeneration. The law of life as set forth in the science under discussion is **not** from the small to the large, but seems on the contrary to be the exact reverse of that procedure. Where the creatures who have lived and have left progeny that have persisted to our present day, so **■** to allow comparison, do not remain fixed, they invariably degenerate. This is seen in the entire realm of paleontology, but is such **■** stumbling block to the theory of evolution that the advocates of that philosophy shy from any mention of this common phenomenon. The fact of degeneration can be well established from the most irrefutable evidence.

The largest creature of the genus *Elephas* the earth has ever harbored is not the familiar "Jumbo" of the modern circus, but the mighty *Elephas imperator* of the past geological age. This mighty monster dwarfs the modern elephant into a veritable pigmy in size, and is the largest of its genus yet known. One of the finest skeletons of this great beast to be seen today is in the Los Angeles County Museum of Arts and Science in Exposition Park, Los Angeles, California, and was dug from the famous Rancho La Brea pits within the city

limits of Los Angeles. We may presume that the far famed California climate had something to do with the growth of this giant; at any rate we feel sure the local Chamber of Commerce would so state if they knew of the presence of this great and monstrous creature within the sphere of their interest! At any rate, here is a notable refutation of the so-called law of evolution; the elephant is proceeding from the large to the small!

In the day when this ~~same~~ imperial elephant roamed this terrain, there dwelt with him in companionship and friendship the giant sloth, called Megatherium. The sloth of the present day is a small creature, weighing only a few pounds. The largest one the author ever examined personally weighed only thirty pounds, and he was unusually large. Yet the sloth of the Pleistocene age literally weighed tons! Specimens have been recovered that weighed four tons, and many that weighed from two to three tons. What happened here? This creature has not evolved, he has degenerated at a tremendous rate. If the law of evolution is from the simple to the complex, the small to the large, and this law had applied to the sloth, that creature would today weigh from six hundred tons to eight hundred tons, if it had evolved ~~on~~ the same proportion that it has shrunk! The sloth, alas for the theory of evolution, has degenerated from the complex to the simple, from the large to the small, and is a living refutation of the truth of the philosophy of evolution.

We are all familiar with the friendly insect that buzzes through the evening twilight and about the lakes and swamps and streams, called variously the dragon fly, mosquito hawk, and in the language of science the order Odonata. Perhaps the most common of these in our sphere is the *Diplax elisa*, which feeds upon

gnats, mosquitoes and small flies which it catches and devours on the wing. A great many interesting things are known by the general public about this insect, most of which are not so! Such as the erroneous idea prevalent among children that it buzzes in a child's ear and makes him deaf; that it gets in a little girl's hair and tangles it all up or that it is harmful to unwary humans. On the contrary it is one of the most beneficial of the predaceous insects, as it not only feeds upon the obnoxious mosquito in the adult age, but the larvae of the dragon fly feed also upon the larvae of the mosquito, thus rendering a two-fold service to mankind in general. How few of us realize that the dragon fly is one of the most ancient orders at present occupying the earth in a living form. Fossil dragon flies are well known, the largest of which have a wing spread of eighteen inches.

Here indeed is degeneration with a vengeance! From eighteen inches wing spread down to four inches is certainly not progress from the small to the large, the simple to the complex. That so-called law was evidently gratuitously evolved out of the need of such a law to sustain the theory of evolution, and is not based on fact. In this respect at least, the spurious law has much in common with most of the fabrication upon which this false doctrine rests its tottering and wobbling structure: all the evidence is against it!

The late Dr. Willis Lee, of the United States Geological Survey, was an ardent evolutionist, and was constantly seeking evidences that would sustain his theory of life origin. About the strongest statement he made was based upon the fact that the ancient reptiles called dinosaurs apparently possessed a gizzard like the modern fowls of the twentieth century. Upon this rather sketchy evidence Dr. Lee said that "the dinosaurs were the lineal progenitors of the modern fowls, and since the reptile ancestors possessed a gizzard it is

not surprising that their present progeny also possess this same organ for the reduction of food." These are his literal words, that the dinosaurs were the direct lineal progenitors of the fowls. Now without accepting his conclusions, to which we do not subscribe, let us follow the argument of this eminent evolutionist and see where it finally leads.

This dinosaur, who according to this high priest of evolution was the grand daddy of the chicken, was the most enormous reptile the earth has ever seen. Reaching a maximum length of ninety feet, standing over twenty feet high in the front shoulders, and weighing eighty-four tons or more, as in the case of *Brontosaurus atlantosaurus*, its very size stupefies the imagination of the present earth dweller. There is nothing to compare with this extinct monster today except the gigantic great whales, and so few of us have ever seen a really large whale we miss the true conception of living mass they convey.

If the eminent Doctor of evolution is correct, and this ninety foot, eighty-five ton creature was the direct ancestor of the modern fowls, what has happened to the law of evolution that calls for an orderly progress from the simple to the complex? How about the gradual development of the small to the large in this specific case? A ninety foot, eighty ton reptile, slowly grows into a ten pound chicken, thus demonstrating the evolution, or growth of the simple to the complex! That statement is far more credible in a joke book planned for the colored minstrel show of a past decade than in the pages of a staid volume of physical science. The ratio of degeneration here expressed would demand a chicken that weighed thirty-four million pounds, if the dinosaur were truly the chicken's ancestor, and evolution's law, from the small to the large, really did operate.

Almost every lay reader has learned some things about the great *Smilodon Californicus* commonly called the Saber-tooth tiger. This great representative of the genus *Felis* once roamed this western slope in marvelous profusion, and it has now been stated that the morphology of the late Saber-tooth tiger is identical with the diminutive wild cat of the Pacific Coast! Here again we see the phenomenon of degeneration, which is the antithesis of the evolutionary process from the small to the large, the simple to the complex.

It is fruitless to further multiply illustrations; paleontology and zoology abound with such contrasts and degenerations. The dread *Tyrannosaurus* has become the relatively insignificant crocodile, the *Stegosaurus* ungulate shrinks to the tiny saurian, mis-named the horned toad; *Tryseratops prorus* leaves his small progeny, the dire wolf of the Pleistocene leaves his smaller present day descendant, and the whole realm of nature rises to testify that creatures that do not remain comparatively fixed, degenerate. And nowhere is there a true demonstration of the process of evolution, that the simple has evolved into the complex, the small has become large.

"How about the horse?" Oh, yes, the horse. We will come to the horse very soon now in this paper, and we will give him adequate attention then. We are very familiar with the belief of the average student that the horse is a positive and perfect demonstration of the theory of evolution in the field of paleontology, and we have read the same text books they learned from. But we have also investigated the horse argument, and have much to say about it. Before turning to that examination, however, let us briefly state

The third fact, which is the marvelous evidence of design and intelligence as applied to the creatures that form the sources of paleontology. As we see the ap-

pearance for the first time in each rock system of certain specific forms and types of life, we note that they suddenly appear perfectly fitted for the environment in which they first appeared. Not that their environment painstakingly shaped them after multiplied experiments with mutable forms, but that they appear at first with the ~~same~~ perfection they possess at the last.

The birds appear fitted with wings, planned and equipped for the medium in which they are to spend so large a part of their life on the globe. The fish first appear with scales, fins and gills, perfectly adapted to the aqueous environment that is their place of abode. The truly arboreal simiadae all appear at the very outset with the caudal appendage that is so valuable an aid to climbing, and the first armadillo bears on his frame the impenetrable armor that all his progeny bear. The animals that need them have teeth, and those that do not, have the essential gizzard. Always, wherever an animal appears it comes perfectly equipped for the sphere in which its life is to be lived, and there is no process of evolutionary preparation. Fully formed, perfectly armed, they spring as Minerva from the forehead of Jove, and the vaunted evolutionary process of age-long preparation is something that the physical creation denies.

Species do not blend into higher and subsequent forms in the record of paleontology, but each species is distinct from each other species, and between each two there is a gulf so impassable that the veriest tyro in research is impressed with its existence. They arise, perfect for their mode of living, suddenly and dramatically, in a manner to be accounted for only on the basis of specific creation. They persist in their present form, clearly allied to their fossil ancestry by unmistakable proof, or else they perish with the same suddenness with which they arose.

The theory of evolution states that the various living creatures, together with all those that have lived in past ages, all arose from one single ancestor. This ancestor, a simple protozoan of the amoeba type, began to feel the first faint stirrings of ambition, and started on that long arduous journey that millions of years later was to result in the production of the crowning animal, called by himself after his arriving MAN. On the way, this process of unfolding that was inherent in the amoeba, incidently produced the one hundred and twenty-five million different species that the earth has sheltered since the process began, and through it all we see the law operating, the simple becoming more and more complex, and the small becoming larger and larger, until life has passed out of the realm of the microscopic into the macroscopic, out of the protozoa into the metazoa. This process of development is only possible as the procedure is constant, and the small becomes the large. Yet the records of paleontology fail to reveal one single species that originated that way! When we ask the evolutionists to show us a demonstration, and to name one species that possesses a fossil ancestry in accord with this philosophy, they with charming unanimity and childlike trustfulness point their collective finger at their prize exhibit, THE HORSE!

It has been the contention of the evolutionist for many years that the entire theory has been absolutely established by the proved evolution of the horse. Here is a case where the small **did** evolve into the large: where the simple **did** become complex! The horse begins his life history on this globe as a little rodent-like mammal about the size of a ground squirrel or a stunted house-cat, and evolves into the two-thousand pound Equus of the present day! Truly that is a demonstration worth while, and if that were truly the ~~case~~ it would establish the theory on this one demonstration

alone. This primitive ancestor of the horse had four toes on his front feet and three on his hind feet, and was as unlike a horse as we have it today, as any creature could possibly be. True, the first horse called Eohippus, appears rather late in the scale of geological time, the first trace appears in the late Eocene period, when mammalian life had been going on for perhaps millions of years already. (The time guess is not original with the author, we merely stress the evolutionary chronology here.) There appears no ancestor for Eohippus whatsoever, except the naive and engagingly child-like statement of the American Museum, that it probably had "Hypothetical ancestors with five toes on each foot, and teeth like monkeys, etc." Do not take the author's word for the truth of that quotation, but read it for yourself in Guide Book Leaflet No. 36, June, 1927.

Now the evolutionary procedure is to start with this tiny fossil creature and arrange a series of twelve fossil animals into a complete genealogy for the modern horse as we see him today. In order to do this it is necessary to violate every rule of accepted scientific procedure and criteria, but the mistress Evolution must be served, and honesty and square dealing are secondary issues. The main thing is to show a constant and steady progress from the simple to the complex, to demonstrate the evolution of the small into the large. In order to do this the horse is an essential witness.

Twelve links. And the evolutionist calls that a complete demonstration! What of the millions upon millions of forms that would be required for the transformation of each species into the next subsequent species? What of the billions of varieties that would be necessary for the gradual development of a horse out of a creature that is more like a civet cat than any other living creature? Can intelligence and reason be con-

tent with twelve links in so great a gap, and call that a complete demonstration? Apparently all this is beside the question; the twelve links are all that we have. Yet the horse is a perfect demonstration of the entire process of evolution, supposedly.

The weakness of the demonstration is further seen when we remember that the horse is a European animal. Long before man appears on the continent of North America, the horse native to this continent had died out. The present race of horses was imported from Europe after Columbus, and even the wild "broom tailed broncs" of the Western plains are descendants of that old importation. It will be remembered that the Mexican Indians were amazed and dumbfounded when the Conquistadors appeared riding on horseback: such a spectacle had never greeted their eyes before. There was a great deal of superstitious reverence for the men who "sprouted from the back of an animal like trees from the soil" and for a long and fatal period the natives hesitated to attack such apparently super-men.

The amazing thing in our study, however, is the fact that the horse, a European animal, has been provided with an American ancestry. Creatures whose fossil remains are never found in Europe, where the horse comes from, are quietly slipped into the "demonstration" and made to do duty as ancestors for those descendants from across the sea. And where there is a gap in the American fossil record, forms that appear in Europe, and not in America, are quietly slipped in, and what chance does the average layman in paleontology have to discern the fraud thus practiced? Thus *Hyracotherium* is found in England only, and but one skull has ever been brought to the light of day. It is sheer folly to build an ancestry on such fragmentary evidence as this, even if the fossil were found on the

same continent with the other "links." The folly of this is so evident that later writers disregard Hyracotherium altogether, and start their record with the more prolific Eohippus, which we have in abundance in our American fossil deposits. An American ancestor for a European horse, which was derived by Europe from Asiatic and African ancestors! The true European horse is not the one that was imported into this continent by the early settlers, and differs quite materially in important structure variations from the hybrid we now possess. Again, we note that Orohippus is purely an American fossil, but here it is in the paleontological ancestry of an Asiatic-African-European immigrant! Could absurdity go farther than this?

Yes, it can, for here there is ingeniously inserted into the American record the European fossil Paleotherium, which has never yet been found on this continent. With its cousin Plagiolophus it was staunchly defended by the eminent Huxley as the direct ancestor of the present horse, but that contention has been exploded and abandoned upon the discovery of more recent evidence. Meshippus and Miohippus are purely American fossils, never found in the European deposits, but here used to do duty as ancestors for a European horse. But the case is evened up again by the insertion into the jumbled record of Anchitherium, a European fossil never found in America. Hypohippus, on the other hand is distinctly American, as are Parahippus, Merychippus, Protohippus and Pliohippus. The score is slightly in favor of the Old World, standing at the present count twelve to four, with Hipparion equally common to the Old World and the New. It seems a shame to muddy the waters any worse, but the sad fact is that our guest is further complicated by the presence of two more fossil forms, namely Hippidium and Onohippidium, which only occur in South Amer-

ica. Truly the perfect case of the horse gives this poor creature a variegated ancestry, geographically speaking, at least.

It is a fatuous proceeding to attempt the construction of a genealogy in this manner, and is an amazing demonstration of the weakness of a theory that has to rely upon such a flimsy structure of spurious evidence as this. In the first place, we have seen that the record will not bear scrutiny, and in the second we see that the arrangement is purely arbitrary. Any impossibility can be made plausible and proved to be a fact by this same procedure. First, we see the evolutionist postulates the purely hypothetical basis that the horse once had four toes on its front feet and three on its rear feet. Then he proceeds to arrange fossil forms that possess these characteristics according to their increasing size, and call that a demonstration. Does he arrange all the forms that are thus equipped, with four toes on the front feet and three on the hind? Indeed he does not: but carefully selects only those forms that will aid his theory. For instance, one very common fossil form has four toes on the front feet and three on the hind, but as he weighed ~~some~~ three tons he is left out. Obviously, you can not prove the evolution "from the simple to the complex, from the small to the large" by having a three ton ancestor for a one ton descendant! So very carefully the evidence is edited and obnoxious types deleted; and we note with wonder and amazement that none of the true horses of past geological ages are included in the record. Why not? They were too big, and were already true horses! You cannot evolve a horse out of a horse—it is a horse already!

The horse today is a variegated genus. From the diminutive Shetland pony to the giant Clydesdale is indeed a tremendous gap; but it is bridged by inter-

mediate forms. Above the Shetland pony is the small grey burro of the western deserts, after him the African zebra, the ass, the western bronc, the smaller saddle stock, the Arabian racer, the Percheron, and a variety of others in size and shape. They are all alive now, and are thus recognized as contemporaries. But if they were all dead, and all we had was their fossil remains, what a case we could make for evolution. We would start our "demonstration" with the skeleton of the pony or the jackass (or even the jack rabbit) and allowing a few million years for each increase in size, show how the gigantic draft stallion evolved from the tiny beginning. But we can't do that now, these specimens are all alive, and ready to give us the horse laugh if we attempt any such chicanery with their bones. The fossil forms, which were probably equally contemporaneous, cannot rise up in protest, however; they have been dead too long. We can examine the case made with their bones, we are alive. And this "demonstration" was evidently not planned for those who were very much alive, mentally at least!

Before examining closely the strength and weakness of the structure of proof, let us first establish the osteological reason for the attempt to evolve a horse out of a multi-toed ancestor. We all know that the horse of the present day has only one toe on each of his four feet, and that this toe is developed into an ungulated basis for his peculiar foot, for the apparent purpose of speed and power in traction. When we examine the skeleton of the horse, however, we are struck with the presence of a bone called the "splint bone" that runs as a sort of brace on the posterior border of the large bone between the "knee" and the "hock." This so-called splint bone runs about two thirds of the way down on the front leg, and about half way on the hind leg. It is wide and thick at the top, gradually decreas-

ing in size to a fraction of an inch at the bottom, where it suddenly terminates. On both the front and the hind legs it forms a magnificent brace, following a principle that is universally accepted in sound engineering practice. If it were not for the contention of the evolutionary school of philosophers, this splint bone, or brace, would be universally recognized as an evidence of design and intelligence in the creation of these creatures whose sole means of defense is their remarkable speed and stamina in flight. This same principle, incidentally, is followed in the structure of the human as well, as the large bone of the lower leg, called the tibia, is braced by a somewhat smaller bone called the fibula. Yet our ancestors had just as many toes as we have, no more and no less.

Unable to accept intelligence or design in creation, however, the evolutionist seeks to account for this splint bone on the basis of the well advertised vestigial theory. This splint bone is thus presumed to be a remnant of a once useful functioning organ essential in the early ancestry of the present horse. The ridiculous fallacy of this contention is apparent at once when we note that the earliest fossil forms all had splint bones; that many other species beside the horse possess them, and that the first so-called ancestor of the horse, the noted Eohippus himself, also had splint bones. Here is a marvel of inconsistency: the splint bones of the present equus are the rudimentary remains of his side toes, which have somehow or other joined themselves together and moved to the rear of the cannon bone to form an essential brace, yet the first fossil horse, so-called, with all its side toes still functioning has these splint bones as well! The splint bone is the remains of the side toes; yet the creatures with the side toes present in their osteology then possessed the splint bones which are made from the disappearing toes! We

confess this is too confusing to make sense to us, and we pass on to other considerations.

Having referred to the evolutionary genealogy of the horse that paleontology is supposed to establish, let us now set that record forth in order to consider it in fullest detail. To remind our readers of the order in which these equine ancestors are given, we review this section of the column of historical geology from the earliest in which our present interest starts to the latest period in which we terminate our record, namely the present age of man. Fossil relics of the horse ancestry are presumed to appear first in the Eocene period, so we start with that.

Eocene. The Tertiary, or age of mammals, begins with the Eocene, and in this period we find Eohippus, Orohippus and Epihippus. This period is credited with being many, many hundreds of thousands of years in extent, and fossils of the horse ancestry are found in the lower, middle, and upper divisions of the Eocene period in similar profusion. The Eocene period is followed by the

Oligocene period, and in this geological period of time we find the horse again present, in the form of Mesohippus and Miohippus. The earth teemed with mammals of many forms in this age, and the fossil record bears witness to the fecundity of the many species that have been preserved in the rock strata of this time. There are many other species that lived then, that resembled the horse far more closely than these that are accepted in the genealogy, but since they cannot be forced to appear as ancestors, we are constrained to accept only these two.

The Miocene Period follows the Oligocene in order of time, and mammals are even more abundant. In this age, although there were many forms that had a resemblance to the horse, we are forced to use only the

two in our demonstration, the American Hypohippus, and the European Anchitherium. There is some confusion here: which specimen should the evolutionist use, the American or the European? Logically he should use the European specimen for an animal that comes to us from Europe, but that is embarrassing, **■** Anchitherium, the fossil we find in the European Miocene strata more closely resembles the American Mesohippus, which lived in America in the preceding geological age, the Oligocene! Then also, to use the European fossil would establish a bad example and a fatal precedent, **■** as we have to rely on the American record to prove our case. So we are forced to stick to the Hypohippus as our Miocene link, and classify him **■** as the Middle Miocene. This again causes some confusion, for we have another Miocene specimen, namely Parahippus. But Parahippus, although far ahead of Hypohippus and much more "horse like," occurs in the Lower Miocene and is centuries and centuries ahead of the horse of which he is the ancestor! We have also Merychippus in the Miocene, as he appears in the Middle and Upper Miocene, and lo! we now have three separate stages of the horse evolution in the same geological age; two of them appearing contemporaneously; and the third, which is the earliest, and thus the geologically youngest, is the farthest along in the evolution of the present equus. This gets more complicated and impossible as we go along. In the Upper Miocene also appears the fossil horse-creature Hipparion, although he is much more common in the period called the

Pliocene. With him there appear in this period also the species called Protohippus, and Pliohippus. Although classified as Pliocene these three forms appear in the Upper Miocene as well, and their value as determining age factor is thus considerably lessened. Pliohip-

pus is the characteristic fossil chosen from this age, so he is placed as the typical link for this period. The Pliocene period is followed by the

Pleistocene, and is characterized by the presence of many varieties of the Genus *Equus*, the true horse family. Indeed, horses that ~~are~~ horses are so numerous in this age that they are an embarrassment to the evolutionist, and so nothing much is said about them. In case the reader is a trifle confused by these species and ages, we will recapitulate in the reverse order from that given. We here offer a simple chart that will show the geological age, and the type of fossil horse that is found in each.

Age	Characteristic Fossil
Pleistocene	Many True Horses, about which the evolutionist is strangely silent.
Pliocene.	Pliohippus.
	Protohippus) These latter two
	Hipparion) found in the Miocene
	also.
Miocene.	Merychippus.
	Parahippus.
	Hypohippus.
	Anchitherium.
Oligocene.	Miohippus.
	Mesohippus.
Eocene.	Epihippus.
	Orohippus.
	Eohippus.
	Hyracotherium. (?)

Following the evolutionary supposition of the orderly procedure from the simple to the complex, the large out of the small, the student would naturally conclude that there is a gradual and ascending increase in the size of each succeeding form, but such is not the case.

The unprejudiced paleontologist is somewhat surprised to learn by observation that some of the earlier and older forms are considerably larger than the later descendants that presumably evolved out of them, and that even in the matter of specialized parts the later ones are sometimes frequently far behind their ancestors! As for instance, in the far away Miocene period the Hypohippus is as large as the modern Shetland pony, while the much more recent Hipparion is decidedly smaller in stature. The course of gradual development of the horse is broken again when the Miohippus becomes larger than its descendants of later ages!

The deciding factor of the position of a fossil creature in any genealogy is generally the factor of dentition. This is so generally accepted that it needs no proof in such a paper as this; we accept the classification of certain related forms on the basis of tooth similarity in practically every branch of science; in paleontology more so than in any other. It would be the natural inference, when we find the small rodent-like Eohippus given as the ancestor of the horse, to suppose that Eohippus had teeth that were similar to the equus family: but such is not the case. The bones of these so-called ancestors also bore no resemblance to the horse family, as is established by the following paragraph taken verbatim from the Guide Leaflet, No. 36, Series of June, 1927, as published by the American Museum of Natural History.

Speaking of the early four-toed "horse," the leaflet states on page fifteen, "The proportions of the skull, the short neck, and arched back, and the limbs of moderate length, were very little horse-like, recalling on the contrary, some modern carnivorous animals, especially the Civets (*Viverridae*). The teeth were short-crowned and covered with low rounded knobs of enamel, suggesting those of monkeys and of pigs or of other omni-

vorous animals, but not at all like the long crowned complicated grinders of the horse."

The teeth of the little rodent-like Eohippus are short crowned, and enamelled, while those of the later "ancestors" are long-crowned, and fused. Again the teeth of the later ancestors are crescented where those of Eohippus are knobbed, and the later types have cemented teeth instead of the enamelled ones of the earlier forms. The skulls of the so-called four-toed horses differ from the true horse types; the feet differ, the cervical vertebrae differ, the entire back differs, all four legs differ, and the teeth bear no resemblance whatever to the horse. Why, then, in the name of common sense and in the light of science, is it called a horse? Simply because evolution demands a demonstration of its fallacious claim, and truth must be sacrificed on the altar of prejudice.

We feel that the case against the horse demonstration would not be complete without a mention of the paleontological fact, that all the evolutionary writers and text books seem so eager to suppress, and that is that there are true fossil horses known to science today! Do we ever hear about them? Indeed, we do not, and for the simple reason that they spoil the "demonstration." How can you show the evolution of a four-toed, rodent-like animal, the size of a cat, into the horse, that weighs a ton, if there was a true horse eating grass side by side with the Eohippus that was just starting in to evolve into a horse thirty million years later? That simply can't be done: so they just suppress any mention of the true horse of fossil ages in North America.

There are at least two of them, the *Equus nevadensis*, and the *Equus occidentalis*. Did the reader ever hear of them? Not if his reading has been confined to evolutionary authors. We desire to stress the *Equus occidentalis* especially, as we are personally familiar

with that variety. This horse (and it was a true horse) roamed the western slope of what is now known as the United States, especially the Pacific Southwest. It was the contemporary of the elephant, the camel and the so-called Saber-tooth Tiger, with all of whose bones the remains of this fossil horse are found in profusion. Long before man appeared on this continent the great creatures that were the companions of the horse disappeared, and the horse likewise vanished with them. But today in profusion we are recovering his fossil remains, and his bones rise up to confront the dogma of science whose basis is prejudice, and to refute the supposed demonstration of his evolution from a creature with whom he was on grazing terms! It is apparent to the most unlearned that the case collapses: If the creature that evolved out of a tiny ancestor millions of years after that ancestor died out, really lived with that ancestor side by side, the supposed demonstration becomes a joke.

So much, then, for the perfect demonstration of the theory of evolution. Like most of the claims of this school, we can see in the attempt to construct a process of evolution out of the fossil record of many horse-like creatures, nothing more or less than the bigotry of prejudice attempting to prove an erroneous theory even at the expense of truth. The greatest scientist of his day, the man of impeccable integrity in fields of research, the American immortal who was the father of paleontology, even the great Agassiz, fought the theory of organic evolution to the very day of his death.

The chain of evidence that purports to support the theory of evolution is a chain indeed, but its links are formed of sand and mist. Analyze the evidence and it melts away; turn the light of true investigation upon its demonstrations and they fade like fog before the freshening breeze. The theory stands today positively dis-

proved, and we will venture the prophecy that in another two decades, when younger men, free from the blind prejudices of a passing generation are allowed to investigate the new evidence, examine the facts, and form their own conclusions, the theory will take its place in the limbo of disapproved things. In that day the world of science will be forced to come back to the unshakable foundation of fact that is the basis of the true philosophy of the origin of life.

What is the true philosophy? What else can it be than the clear and scientific statement of the man Moses? He said that in the beginning God created each creature after its own kind, and ordained that they should multiply and reproduce, each always after its own kind. This we submit as the only intelligible, the only certain, and the one scientific explanation of the presence of the different species that has ever come from the pen of living man.

We take our stand with Moses, with the records of paleontology, and the amazing mass of evidence in every physical science that bears on the question of the nature and origin of life, content to ascribe the marvelous phenomena of a marvelous creation to the unlimited power of God.

OTHER PAPERS BY THE SAME AUTHOR

- "Spiritism in the Light of Science and the Bible"
- "Monkeyshines: Fakes, Fables and Facts Concerning Evolution"
- "The Theories of Evolution and the Facts of Paleontology"
- "The Facts of Biology and the Theories of Evolution"
- "A Scientist's Viewpoint of the Virgin Birth"
- "Embryology and the Recapitulation Theory"
- "Modern Science, Noah's Ark, and the Deluge"
- "Modern Science, Jonah and the Whale"
- "Modern Science and the First Fundamental"
- "Modern Science in an Ancient Book"
- "Modern Science and the Long Day of Joshua"
- "Modern Science and the Prologue of Genesis"
- "Modern Science and the First Day of Genesis"
- "Modern Science and the Second Day of Genesis"
- "Modern Science and the Third Day of Genesis"
- "Modern Science and the Fourth Day of Genesis"
- "Modern Science and the Fifth Day of Genesis"
- "Modern Science and the Sixth Day of Genesis"
- "The Trial and Death of Jesus" (Outlines for Study)
- "Harmony of Science and the Scriptures"
- "The Theories of Evolution and the Facts of Human Antiquity"
- "The Credibility of the Chronology of the Bible"
- "Syllabus of Bible Study in Christian Evidences"
- A Debate (The Creative Days were Literal Solar Days)
(All the above list 25c each.)
- "Modern Science and the Youth of Today"
(10c. per copy.)
- "Voices from the Silent Centuries"
(50c)

Order from

RESEARCH SCIENCE BUREAU, INC.

c/o Glendale Printers

216 South Brand Boulevard

Glendale, California

